DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 213 UD 020 633

AUTHOR Williams, David L., Jr.
TITLE Validation of Effective Staff Development/Inservice Education Strategies.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 49p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction. Table 5 will not reproduce well due to print size. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Desegregation Methods: Desegregation Plans: Elementary Secondary Education: Inservice Teacher Education: Interviews: *Program Development: *Program Improvement: *School Desegregation: *Staff Development: Surveys

ABSTRACT

The goal of the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools (WIEDS) project is to establish a regional information base for the southwestern United States (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas) concerning successful desegregation strategies and remaining areas of need in desegregated schools. Such information will be the basis for developing a set of staff development/ inservice education (SD/IE) models and guidelines for desegregated and desegregating schools. This paper describes a survey and interviews conducted by WIEDS of local school superintendents, General Assistance Center personnel, parents and community people, school personnel, and students in the six-state area as a means of identifying important elements which can assist in developing such models and guidelines. Data obtained from the survey and interviews were analyzed to examine the relationships between demographic characteristics of sites, respondents, and interviewees and (1) their perceptions regarding desegregation strategies employed and (2) their reports of remaining areas of need. Findings indicate that no one set of strategies alone can be employed to facilitate successful desegregation, and that collaboration and cooperation by many levels of people and on a variety of issues and activities are required. Based on implications of the findings, 17 content areas are identified for inclusion in SD/IE models and guidelines. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAY 1 6 1980

TM

ED189213

VALIDATION OF EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT/INSERVICE EDUCATION STRATEGIES

David L. Williams, Jr., Director
Division of Community and Family Education
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
Boston, Massachusetts

April 7-11, 1980

UD020633

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James W. Kunetka
SW Ed. Dev. Lab.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MAY 1 1980

Introduction

Staff development and inservice education (SD/IE) are critical aspects of efforts designed to effectively prepare school staff who work or will work in desegregated public schools. Among the myriad of difficult issues that public schools face today and tomorrow, desegregation could become an auspicious one. Since no other major institution in our society has (1) assumed leadership in developing mutual respect, understanding and cooperation among the racial and class groups in our society and (2) fomented equal opportunity, cross-cultural sharing with respect to our multicultural heritage and existence, the burden has been placed upon public schools. It is through the schools that the well-known and society-damaging vestiges of prejudice, racism, stereotyping and segregation are expected to be confronted and eliminated. Clearly, this is an awesome task for all of society's important institutions combined, let alone the schools by themselves. While judicial and legislative actions (Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education [1954], U. S. Civil Rights Acts [1964, 1978, etc.], et al) have had some effect on political, economic, religious, and social/welfare institutions in our country, the educational institutions, especially public schools, have borne the brunt of desegregation's impact. Bearing such a burden has real implications for the kind of learning environment and experiences being offered and the extent and quality of knowledge and skills among those who offer them. Thus, if schools can, through desegregation, integrate our pluralistic cultures and provide quality educational experiences for all learners, then many of the problems our society faces can be lessened.

One of the more common methods utilized to improve or broaden the knowledge and skills of school staff is SD/IE. This is especially true of

desegregating and/or desegregated schools. For this paper, SD/IE are used together and refer to activities which a school district conducts as a means of training the staff they employ with respect to the particular kinds of educational approaches or strategies being employed. While SD/IE will be defined as such for this paper, it must be viewed in a larger context as described by Howsam (1976).

According to Howsam, there are three distinct aspects of educating and preparing teachers (or administrators) for working effectively in schools. These are (1) preservice education, (2) inservice education (used along with staff development for this paper) and (3) continuing education. It is maintained by Howsam that failure to understand the respective roles of the teaching profession, school systems and teacher preparation institutions with regard to these aspects causes (1) confusion and (2) a lack of accomplishing goals concerning the education of school staff. Understanding the clear distinction between these respective roles can help eliminate these two causal problems.

Preservice education pertains to the preparation of teachers prior to entering into the profession of teaching. This is clearly in the purview of teacher preparation institutions. It normally occurs on a college or university campus with hopefully some real interaction and experience provided with respect to the "real world" of teaching--the public schools. Continuing education, basically, involves self-improvement of school staff through graduate work, workshops, courses, etc. and is initiated by each individual moreso for personal gain (e.g., salary increase, promotion, etc.) (Howsam, 1976). Given these distinctions, the remainder of this paper will focus on SD/IE in desegregated schools. However, SD/IE is not considered as an entity

unto itself, but rather as an important aspect of a triadic process with respect to the education and preparation of public school staff.

SD/IE has been an important aspect of research activities in the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools (WIEDS) Project. This project is one of three within the Division of Community and Family Education (DCAFE) at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). The long range goal of Project WIEDS is as follows: To establish a regional base of information concerning successful strategies and remaining need areas in desegregated schools from pertinent documents and the viewpoints of students, community persons (parents included), teachers, principals and selected central office personnel as the basis for developing a set of staff development/inservice education models and guidelines.

To accomplish this goal, Project WIEDS has undertaken several distinct activities in order to build its information base. These have included (1) reviewing the desegregation literature, (2) analyzing the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Desegregation Case Studies and the National Institute of Education's School Desegregation Ethnographies, (3) surveying central office administrators and General Assistance Center personnel in the SEDL six-state region,* (4) interviewing administrators, teachers, students, parents/other community representatives, and (5) reviewing SD/IE plans from selected school districts. This paper will deal with findings from (1) a survey and (2) interviews as a means of identifying important elements which can assist in developing SD/IE models and guidelines for desegregated/desegregating schools.

---

*The SEDL region includes these states: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas.

Background

The importance of SD/IE to the success of desegregating and eventually integrating public schools has been discussed by educational lay persons, professionals and researchers. While there may not be total agreement upon the kinds of SD/IE strategies that should be used in desegregated/desegregating schools, it is clear that this element is a critical one. Mizell (1979) provided a checklist of items for four major areas where local people, according to their responsibility--parent, teacher, school board member or legislator--need to take action for the educational interests of all children. Four items which appear to have direct implications for SD/IE are as follows:

1. Parents and citizens should work with classroom teachers to identify the types of administrative and instructional support needed to improve teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

2. Teachers should acknowledge they don't possess essential skills to meet all children's instructional needs and make it clear they want, need and are willing to accept assistance to strengthen their skills.

3. Teachers should insist they have access to inservice and instructional development opportunities which will assist them in better meeting the needs of children. Also be receptive to mandated training which is related to system-wide/school-wide problems or which is for the purpose of correcting teacher's deficiencies.

4. State and local boards of education should examine the effectiveness of current inservice training programs for teachers. Place more emphasis on inservice training at the local school level as a response to problems encountered or caused by teachers.

Mizell emphazised the need to bring skills directly to bear at the individual classroom level as a means of better serving the educational interests of children included having relevant inservice programs for teachers which (1) take place in classrooms and (2) deal with real problems identified by teachers.

Grant and Melnick (1976) state that in order for contemporary development of inservice education programs to be effective they (1) must avoid past mistakes, (2) deal with offered criticisms and (3) use a broad-based plan built upon a sound conceptual framework with respect to present needs. Stress must be placed upon collaborative and comprehensive inservice education programs that have content relevance for teachers in a pluralistic society. It was further stated that a fundamental and integrating theme of all inservice programs must be an awareness, acceptance, affirmation, and respect of racial, cultural, sex and individual differences. Thus, with the significant population of minority group pupils in public schools, Grant and Melnick conclude that inservice programs which will help teachers to work more effectively with all children must be multicultural in nature and content.

School staff preparation and ultimately their contribution to successful desegregation hinges in part on effective SD/IE activities. A basic focus of such activities must involve training staff in how to deal with and then teach children who have had inferior educational experiences. In addition, such staff needs broadened skills in teaching heterogeneous groups. The implication for SD/IE is staff training that deals with such points as (1) self analysis to avoid stereotyping and discriminatory behavior, (2) in-depth knowledge about characteristics and backgrounds of different groups, (3) techniques for heterogeneous teaching and (4) techniques for daily problem-solving which avoid crises and relieve apprehensions (Gay, 1978). Two large issues for SD/IE planners to focus on appear to be what are the appropriate strategies for school staff and how to ensure that these strategies are adopted, used and effective.

There has been a tendency for SD/IE programs to reflect more cognizance and inclusion of multicultural (including bilingual) content, but not nearly to the extent necessary. The assumption of responsibility for such content is necessary for at least two reasons. First, intercultural contact in our society is increasing at a swift pace. Second, schools, which essentially have been saddled with the tasks of desegregating then moving towards integrating our society, need to change the manner in which they train staff to provide appropriate educational experiences for learners. Clark (1979) more succinctly stated that the intensity placed upon continued desegregation of schools must be accompanied by equal intensity toward improving the quality of education in our schools. Schools are chided to provide a basic education for all learners regardless of intelligence level. Such educational experiences at a minimum should teach learners how to read, write, deal with numbers and think both creatively and critically. These are deemed necessary preparatory skills for human beings to cope with the problems and requirements of today's and tomorrow's democratic society, especially as culturally pluralistic interactions increase.

SD/IE, which has multicultural education as one of its fundamental tenets, is relevant for all public schools, but especially those which are desegregating or desegregated. If schools, and eventually our society, are to progress from desegregation to totally integrated entities, then multicultural education which emphasizes the pluralistic uniqueness and value of our society must be promoted. One of the most appropriate vehicles through which this can be accomplished is SD/IE.

Ideally, multicultural SD/IE increases the awareness of all people in the education process--minority as well as majority. Majority educators

generally have the most to gain from SD/IE, for education continues to present and/or emphasize a white, middle income, Protestant, northern European, male point of view. In order to survive, minority-group members have had to thoroughly acquaint themselves with the majority culture. A reciprocal acquaintance has not been necessary for most members of the majority culture. Further, among minority groups there is much to be learned from and about each other. School staff education, preparation and experiences have not, for example, typically provided blacks with sufficient knowledge of the Hispanic American, Indian or Asian populace. Also, little is known about blacks by their minority counterparts. Thus, SD/IE when effectively planned and implemented, can become a relevant and useful learning experience for all school staff and eventually all learners.

The need to learn about minority cultures different from the mainstream is not new, but indeed is perplexing for majority school staff and even more difficult to relevantly infuse into school learning environments and experiences. Public education itself originated in order to help immigrants assimilate into U. S. society. Thus, the historical emphasis on eliminating differences, on blending into the whole, is still flourishing. The attitudes among many school staff that multicultural education is (1) for minorities only, and (2) that it has little, if any academic respectability, are unfortunately prevalent even today (Boyer, 1977). Thus, the need for SD/IE which emphasizes the nature and importance of multicultural education becomes more evident.

It is generally accepted in the field of education, as with other segments in our society, that issues tend to rise and then fall or fade away. Much of this is subject to the sometimes clear and sometimes not

so clear needs expressed by society members. As an example, hue and cry for basic skills, literacy, education of the handicapped, minimal competency, etc. have tended to detract from the school desegregation focus. It should be re-emphasized though that (1) desegregation is still a major issue facing our schools, (2) it still has not been adequately dealt with and (3) when effectively carried out, it could have a positive effect on the aforementioned issues which detract from it. Somehow the understanding and realization that well-planned and implemented school desegregation will effectively address most of the major educational issues of today escapes those demanding better schooling.

One of the most apparent problems of SD/IE programs is that of relevance to the needs of school staff and learners. SD/IE in desegregated/desegregating schools must be designed for all staff in the school district, whether certified or non-certified. What happens in the hall, the bus, the cafeteria and on the playground of these schools is as much a part of each student's curriculum as classroom activities. Further, what happens in such schools, both to students and to staff, is often taken home and shared with family members or others in the community. Negative desegregated school experiences which are shared with the home and community tend to reinforce and broaden negative attitudes/feelings toward desegregated/desegregating schools. However, the relating of positive experiences can help to increase both confidence and trust in these schools. One method of ensuring that positive attitudes and feelings about schools are augmented involves allowing parents and other community persons the opportunity for input regarding SD/IE. Through such input and even participation in desegregated/desegregating school SD/IE activities, the chances for relevance and success are enhanced.

Because desegregated SD/IE is often considered to be "new" and sometimes emotion-laden, care must be taken to include planners who have divergent but complementary opinions and a firm commitment to make it succeed. Innovative approaches should also be part of the process; for example, training building-level persons who can then train their peers and perhaps others in the district is a viable option. Such an approach taps the enthusiasm and talent of those who are committed to SD/IE, builds a resource within the district, and reduces the need, expense, and sometimes negative reaction with respect to outside consultants.

Minor details, when not fully attended to, can cause major SD/IE problems. Therefore, SD/IE should be planned at low-stress periods of the year to reduce what for some may already be an anxious experience. SD/IE goals, objectives, and activity descriptions should be disseminated well in advance of the actual events. SD/IE consultant and facilitator skills must be well matched with the tasks to be performed and the participants. SD/IE support systems need to be developed to lessen negative comments, aspects, or feelings and building on positive suggestions. Attention to such details in SD/IE planning and implementation help to increase its relevance and effectiveness.

Many of the problems that arise with respect to SD/IE appear to center around the fact that (1) usually no relevant preliminary needs assessing is done; (2) there are no specific objectives developed related to needs; (3) school staff are not usually consulted about their goals, objectives, concerns, and interests; (4) little or no communication exists between planners and participants regarding such details as time, place, purpose, value, and remuneration/credit available; (5) no pre-post assessment takes

place; (6) no effective evaluation and subsequent feedback occurs; (7) no resources are provided for additional action after the inservice; (8) short-range, "one-shot" approaches are consistently used instead of long-range, step-by-step plans (Cunningham, 1970; Bhaerman, 1977; Darland and Luke, 1977).

The assessment of SD/IE activities often leaves much to be desired. Evaluation efforts typically have taken the form of (1) none at all, (2) checklists, (3) short-statement responses, (4) non-systematically designed data gathering, (5) narrow testing of outcomes, and (6) no follow-up, short term or long term study of effects. Obviously, one of the more useful methods of assessing SD/IE is some form of pre-post testing with the post-test effort consisting of several phases.

Research and evaluation efforts regarding SD/IE need to be better planned and conducted in public schools, especially in desegregated/desegregating schools. For school districts just beginning the desegregation process, the opportunities to conduct useful research and evaluation of the SD/IE effectiveness are all too often poorly planned or lost. Frequently, it is fear, a lack of the understanding and usefulness, inappropriate methods and focus (e.g., outcome regarding achievement only as opposed to process and strategy effectiveness), that hinder the conduct of useful SD/IE research and evaluation with respect to school desegregation. There are several directions in which such SD/IE research and evaluation activities can proceed and be useful. In doing so, an important overriding issue should be kept in mind: how to further enhance the relevance, meaning, and utility of educational experiences of all learners and school staff but particularly those in desegregated schools. Research in areas such as the following will help to successfully undertake it:

1. nature and solutions of teaching problems as perceived by teachers in desegregated schools

2. nature and proliferability of successful SD/IE programs in desegregated schools

3. nature of relationship between desegregated school teacher/administrator preservice and their SD/IE inservice experiences.

4. nature of relationship between SD/IE and desegregated school staff effectiveness

5. nature of relationship between desegregated school SD/IE and student outcomes or achievement

6. nature of relationship between desegregated school SD/IE and improved home-school-community interactions

The aforementioned areas of potential SD/IE research with respect to desegregated schools are not all-inclusive. Rather, their mention is an attempt to illustrate the definite need for additional SD/IE research as a means of enhancing teaching/learning/administrative success in desegregated schools. To subsequently be useful for everyone associated with education in desegregated schools, SD/IE research must abandon "one-shot only" approaches and move toward in-depth comparative, ethnographic, follow-up and longitudinal types of studies.

This discussion has been an attempt to emphasize the importance of SD/IE in desegregated/desegregating schools. The basic purpose of SD/IE is to promote professional and personal growth of school staff by providing them with new and/or supplementary knowledge, skills and attitudes. In addition to improving their own capabilities, school staff, through SD/IE, are expected to enhance the relevance and meaning of educational experiences for all learners but especially those in desegregated/desegregating schools. The meaning of SD/IE in relationship to preservice education and continuing education for school staff, the stress upon SD/IE which is multicultural in

terms of its goals, objectives and activities, the need for SD/IE which is relevant for all of today's and tomorrow's staff and learners, and the use of innovative yet meaningful approaches to SD/IE research and evaluation are the major points accentuated here.

Although SD/IE for school staff in general and desegregated/desegregating school staff in particular still leaves much to be desired, there appear to be signs that it is improving. But much remains to be done so that SD/IE emerges as an integral and relevant part of life in schools. SD/IE must be completely integrated with the needs of learners and staff in desegregated/desegregating schools.

While early childhood education, bilingual education, education of handicapped, sex role/status education, basic educational skills are important issues for SD/IE to be relevant to, it must keep the multicultural feature and needs of our society as the basic tenet. With such a relevant and important focus, SD/IE can move to the forefront regarding educational preparation of school staff and educational success of learners especially in desegregated/desegregating schools.

Procedures

Survey: A survey was conducted of local school superintendents and General Assistance Center (GAC) personnel in the SEDL six-state region. The purpose was to have these respondents (1) identify and rate effectiveness of strategies used in the desegregation process, and (2) identify factors regarding problems/remaining areas of need. Basically, four criteria were used for potential survey districts: (1) size--based on average daily attendance, (2) location within state, (3) classification according to rural, urban, suburban, and (4) having ESAA Project in district.

A total of 262 districts were identified (184 who met ESAA criterion and 78 without ESAA grants but met size and location criteria). State educational directories were used to obtain names and addresses of superintendents for each district.

Survey instrument categories and items were developed from examining the desegregation literature, and the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Desegregation Case Studies. Essentially, the categories for which data were collected are as follows:

1. Demographic

    a. District characteristics
    b. Respondent characteristics

2. Desegregation Strategy Effectiveness

    a. Racial balancing
    b. Community involvement
    c. Crisis prevention
    d. Multicultural infusion
    e. Compensatory education
    f. Race relations
    g. Staff development
    h. Administrative procedures

3. District Desegregation History

4. Sources of Pressure to Desegregate

5. Perceived Problems/Areas of Need

The instrument was pre-tested with six (6) school district personnel, two (2) Texas Education Agency persons and two (2) SEDL staff members. Revisions were made based upon feedback from the pre-test participants and by consultants from Anderson and Berdie Associates, Inc.

A total of 245 potential respondents (209 districts and 36 GAC personnel) replied that they were willing to participate in the survey effort. Superintendents and GAC Directors indicated that either they would fill out the

instrument or would designate the appropriate person to do so. The distribution of committed respondents by state is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. BREAKDOWN OF POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS BY STATE

STATE	SUPERINTENDENTS	GAC PERSONNEL	TOTAL
Arkansas	21	5	26
Louisiana	26	3	29
Mississippi	22	5	27
New Mexico	15	7	22
Oklahoma	30	6	36
Texas	95	10	105
TOTALS	209	36	245

The survey instrument was mailed along with a cover letter and a postage-paid return envelope. Respondents were given six weeks to complete and return the instrument. During the interim, three follow-up efforts were initiated to spur return of the survey. As the instruments were received, they were checked for completeness. In cases where information was incomplete, telephone calls were made to obtain the remaining data. Once completed, each instrument was pre-coded and prepared for data analysis. The analysis process was facilitated by using a closed-response format and required ratings on a five (5) point scale where a negative effect response represented one end of the scale and positive effect response the opposite end.

Interviews: Tape recorded interviews were conducted with parents/other community persons, students, teachers, principals and central office administrators in the SEDL six-state region. The purpose of these interviews was

to gather qualitative information from participants regarding (1) perceptions of desired desegregation outcomes, (2) perceptions of successful desegregation strategies used, (3) perceptions of remaining needs/problems and (4) cultural differences among these perceptions. Potential school districts for the interview phase were initially identified from the list of survey respondents. In addition, information was sought and provided by SEDL Board Members and members of SEDL's Regional Exchange Project's Advisory Board. Suggestions were elicited regarding school districts which, to the extent possible, (1) were exemplary in their desegregation experience, (2) were at a minimum bi-racial with at least two being tri-racial and having at least 20% but not more than 75% minority population, (3) had average daily attendance of at least 1,000 to 10,000 students, (4) had at least 4-25 schools, (5) were recognized or known with respect to desegregation history, (6) were in reasonable access from Austin, (7) would cooperate in such a research effort. In sum, quality and demographic criteria were used in the selection process.

As a result, sixteen (16) potential sites were identified. Letters were written to potential sites and follow-up telephone discussions held as a means of further explaining the project's goals. This process reduced the number of potential sites to nine (9). More descriptive information was provided and detailed telecons held. After negotiations were completed, six (6) sites were selected, one from each of the six states.

Interview schedules were developed for each level of participants (central office personnel, students, parents/community persons, teachers and principals). The basic question and probe items were generated from the previously discussed survey. Interview schedules were pre-tested at a local high school in Austin with permission from the school district. Critiques/

reviews by SEDL staff and external consultants (including Anderson and Berdie) were requested and provided.

To facilitate the interview process, each selected district appointed a liaison person for WIEDS staff to contact, select interviewees, arrange for interview scheduling (dates, places, time, etc.) and provide transportation for staff where possible. All interviews were conducted at the site of each selected school district. Length of interviews ranged from 30 minutes to one hour. In the case of those not preferring to tape their interview, WIEDS staffers conducted the interview orally and recorded written response information on the schedule. It was projected that data would be collected from each of the six sites according to the breakdown shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. BREAKDOWN OF POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEES BY SITE AND LEVEL

SITE	CENTRAL OFFICE	PRINCIPALS	TEACHERS	STUDENTS	PARENT/ COMMUNITY	TOTALS
Texas	2	3	9	9	9	32
Louisiana	2	3	9	9	9	32
Oklahoma	2	3	9	9	9	32
Arkansas	2	3	9	9	9	32
Mississippi	2	3	9	9	9	32
New Mexico	2	3	9	9	9	32
TOTALS	12	18	54	54	54	192

The interview schedules were basically semi-structured in format. They dealt with specific items regarding information about interviewee demographics, perceptions of the desegregation process and need/problem areas. However,

participants were allowed some flexibility to discuss certain issues in-depth in relation to their desegregation experiences. This allowed for some exploration of perceptions beyond that which the structured question responses would reveal. All interview tapes were transcribed and data were recorded based upon predetermined coding categories.

Data Analysis: Both the survey and the interviews generated large volumes of data. The data were analyzed to examine relationships between demographic characteristics of sites, respondents and interviewees and (1) their perceptions regarding desegregation strategies employed along with (2) their reports of remaining need/problem areas. For the interview data analyses, a taxonomic classification system was used to reduce and classify the narrative data. This system was consistent with efforts in the literature review and survey efforts. Three broad areas make up the classification system: (1) Central Office Level (district-wide), (2) Principal Level (school) and (3) Teacher Level (classroom). Sub-categories for each of these levels included administrative/governance, staff development and teaching/learning.

Responses were tabulated by response groups in order tc detect differences as reported by each group. Correlations were sought with respect to the presence of certain desegregation strategies and trends accompanied by these techniques. Thus, analyses involved the use of contingency tabling and simple multiple correlation statistical procedures. Such procedures were applied to the data through computerized methods.

Limitations

No randomization techniques were used in selecting survey respondents or interviewees. Therefore, the participants may not be a true representation

of the diversity of viewpoints which may exist in the districts. WIEDS' indications are that findings from each research activity tend to be consistent with findings from the desegregation literature review regarding strategy utilization and need/problem areas. The extent and quality of interview site cooperation ranged from inadequate to extremely effective. This resulted in fewer interviews than agreed upon at some sites and reduced time for others because of inadequate prior scheduling. A direct outcome was that of incomplete interviews at some sites.

Experience with desegregation varied among site staff interviewed and surveyed. Where the more experience existed, participants were more knowledgeable, sensitive and committed with respect to desegregation and its assorted issues. Less experienced participants were the often less reflective of these attributes and it appears their responses reflected the same. Interviewee selection and selection of the person to complete the survey when superintendents didn't, were left to the district's discretion. While attempts were made by sites to adhere to race, sex and participant level requirements for interviewees, WIEDS could not ensure that a diversity of viewpoints were represented.

Survey responses to effectiveness ratings were perceptions of one person in each site's central office. WIEDS could not determine the extent to which these responses were reflective of total district thinking. Respondents to the survey were similar with respect to ethnicity, occupation and age, e.g., approximately 75% were Anglo, male and over 40 years old. Given more diversity among the respondents regarding these variables may have produced different results. Respondents provided data that were mostly retrospective in nature. Recall, as such, can detract from the accuracy of reported data. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in consideration of these limiting factors.

Findings

The findings reported in this paper deal specifically with comparisons between survey respondent and interviewee perceptions with respect to successful SD/IE strategies and remaining need/problem areas regarding school desegregation. Selected demographic characteristics describing actual survey respondents are presented in Table 3 with corresponding descriptions of interview participants in Table 4. A total of 132 superintendents or other central office personnel completed the survey instrument along with 16 GAC personnel. Approximately 60% (148 out of 245) of the potential respondents completed the survey form.

TABLE 3. SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS COMPLETING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SEX		AGE				ETHNICITY				NO. OF YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION			
M	F	Under 30	30-40	41-50	50+	Anglo	Black	Hispanic	Am. Ind.	Less than 1	1-5	6-10	10+
121	10	none	17 (13%)	52 (39%)	59 (39%)	104 (79%)	9 (7%)	12 (9%)	6 (5%)	14 (11%)	61 (46%)	34 (26%)	22 (17%)

These data indicate that a majority of the participants were Anglo males, more than 40 years old, having worked in their current positions for less than six years. In addition, approximately 57% (84) reported having spent six or more years as classroom teachers with 62% (70) reporting to have had in-depth involvement with their district's desegregation process.

A total of 193 persons took part in the interviews. The projected total number of interviews (32) per site varied slightly with respect to actual interviews conducted at each site. More specifically the totals by site are as follows: Texas - 35; Louisiana - 34; Oklahoma - 31; Arkansas - 32; New Mexico - 27; and Mississippi - 34. Selected demographic data describing interviewees are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4. SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWEES

CHARACTERISTICS / LEVELS	ETHNICITY				SEX		AGE				PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN DESEGREGATION		
	A	B	H	Am. Ind.	F	M	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+	Limited	General	In-Depth
1. Central Office Administrators	13	3	1	0	4	13	0	2	9	6	4	3	10
2. Principals*	9	6	1	0	7	10	0	0	9	8	2	3	12
3. Teachers	21	23	6	4	32	22	10	20	11	6	7	17	18
4. Parents/Community Persons	23	20	5	5	27	26	1	13	17	16	5	13	25
5. Students	24	7	7	4	26	26	Jr. High Middle School		** High School				
							12		40				

*Other/Lebanese
**By grade level instead of age

As these data indicate, there were relatively fewer minority and women Central Office administrators, although WIEDS staff suggested that for its purposes, "central office" would include curriculum specialists, program directors, and others who had responsibilities in more than one school. Only two of the four minority central office administrators interviewed were women and none were American Indian. Of the central office interviewees, the minority administrators proportionately had more in-depth personal involvement in desegregation of their schools. Slightly more than half (7 of 13) of the Anglos had in-depth involvement, 75% (3 of 4) of the minorities did.

Of the seventeen (17) principals interviewed, minorities proportionately had more in-depth involvement in desegregation of their schools.

Minority principals interviewed were equally divided between men and women while Anglo disproportion was not as pronounced as with principals (6 to 3) as with central office (11 to 2).

Of teacher interviewees, there were more minorities and women having a heavier personal involvement in desegregation activities. Black and Anglo teachers were involved at about the same ratio with Hispanic and American Indians less involved. As groups, the minority teachers were younger than the Anglo, indicating perhaps that as the LEAs desegregated and hired more minority teachers, they hired younger ones, and that probably fewer new Anglo teachers have been hired recently.

Student data indicate that race and sex balance of these interviewees was roughly proportional to the total enrollments of the six LEAs. As seems to be the case in most desegregated schools, faculty and especially administrative staffs are seldom racially balanced in proportion to their respective student bodies with there generally being significantly higher proportions of Anglos.

Among the parents interviewed, more than half reported in-depth involvement in desegregation of their schools. Again, the Black, Hispanic, and American Indian were more involved than Anglos, although white parents were more involved than white educators. Minority parents interviewed, especially Hispanic and Indian, were older than Anglo parent interviewees. Almost equal numbers of mothers and fathers were interviewed. An interesting finding not shown here was that approximately 33% (6 of 17) of the central office administrators, 50% (8 of 17) of the principals, and 40% (22 of 54) of the teachers interviewed, revealed that they had no training related to desegregation prior to its occurrence in their districts or schools.

A majority (57%) of the survey respondents indicated that their districts were rural in nature, with 29% describing their districts as urban and approximately 10% indicated as suburban. About three-fourths (76.5%) of the survey respondents reported that their districts had applied for and received ESAA funds during the 1977-78 school year.

The framework for conducting the survey and interviews, along with developing instruments for each is embedded in the WIEDS' eight (8) basic school desegregation goal areas and their set of related strategies. The strategies were grouped according to specifically defined goal areas based upon synthesis of information derived from an in-depth literature review of school desegregation. This review was conducted in an earlier phase of the WIEDS Project. The goal areas and their respective strategy sets are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 8. WEEDS SCHOOL DESEGREGATION GOAL AREAS AND RELATED STRATEGIES

Goal Area One: Student and/or Faculty Racial Balancing

Strategies:
1. increase number of minority staff
2. teacher reassignment
3. school district zoning/boundary changes
4. within school grade level reorganization
5. closing of schools
6. construction of new schools
7. pairing or clustering of schools
8. student transfers
9. open enrollment
10. magnet or special schools
11. educational parks or plazas
12. metropolitan cooperation (i.e., urban-suburban student exchanges)

Goal Area Two: Promoting Community Involvement and/or Improving Community Communications

Strategies:
1. appoint/select school district/community liaison or advisory group(s)
2. dissemination of written information
3. parent participation in school social events
4. parents as volunteers
5. parents as school employees
6. public forum/community meetings
7. community liaison workers
8. media advertising
9. human relations training for parents
10. information center
11. rumor/complaint hot line
12. creation of community centers
13. parent "dry run" bus rides

Goal Area Three: Prevention/Resolution of Crisis Situations Brought on by Desegregation

Strategies:
1. liaison efforts with law enforcement
2. crisis intervention team
3. crisis hot line

Goal Area Four: Infusing a Multicultural/Multi-ethnic Perspective into Education

Strategies:
1. multicultural materials
2. multicultural bulletin board and school decorations
3. increased number of minority staff
4. ethnic/cultural activities (e.g., promotion of cultural heritage clubs, etc.)
5. celebration of ethnic holidays
6. increased number of bilingual staff

Goal Area Five: Promoting Compensatory Education for Minority Students

Strategies:
1. increased number of teacher aides
2. vocational training programs
3. reduction of teacher-pupil ratio
4. use of community resources
5. peer tutoring
6. counseling for GED
7. procedures/resources to promote pupil social adjustment
8. promotion of teaching methods to emphasize pupil cooperation and eliminate competition
9. programs/other activities in bilingual education
10. parents as classroom resources
11. home-based instruction
12. after-school program for minority underachievers
13. early-arriver program for minority underachievers

Goal Area Six: Promoting Positive Race Relations

Strategies:
1. minority participation in extra-curricular activities
2. minority participation in student government
3. individualized instruction
4. racially balancing classrooms
5. field trips
6. minority participation in accelerated classes
7. student/faculty work-related contact (e.g., committees, etc.)
8. human relations activities for students
9. team teaching
10. elimination of ability groupings
11. inter-ethnic social activities
12. procedures for students to communicate about desegregation related issues
13. open classrooms
14. current student orientations for new students
15. nongraded instruction
16. procedures to keep students informed about desegregation issues
17. increased student-faculty social contact (e.g., retreats, etc.)
18. pupil inter-ethnic pairing or grouping

Goal Area Seven: Staff Development for Desegregation Related Issues

Strategies:
1. classroom management training
2. teaching effectiveness training
3. values clarification training
4. training for use of multi-ethnic materials
5. training to inform staff about desegregation-related issues
6. soliciting staff input about desegregation-related issues
7. discipline skills training
8. race stereotyping and terminology training
9. communications skill training
10. reality therapy training
11. input to faculty from resource personnel about desegregation-related issues
12. training for use of bilingual materials
13. training in ethnic linguistic patterns

Goal Area Eight: Administrative Procedures Used to Facilitate Desegregation Process

Strategies:
1. solicitation of ESAA funds
2. upgrading school facilities
3. enlarging counseling programs
4. expansion of multicultural materials
5. modification of discipline policies/procedures
6. use of outside consultants
7. creation of new extra-curricular activities
8. hiring bilingual teachers
9. upgrading student services
10. hiring desegregation specialist

Survey Results

Survey respondents used a five-point rating scale to indicate their perceived effectiveness of strategies in each goal area. The format was as follows:

Negative Effect	•	No Effect	•	Positive Effect
1	2	3	4	5

Data presented in Table 6 indicate the ranking of goal areas as determined by averaged percentages of all strategies reported as being effective ($\bar{X}$% 4+5 ratings) within each goal area.

TABLE 6. RANKINGS OF GOAL AREAS BASED UPON AVERAGE OF REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGIES

RANK	GOAL AREA	AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF 4+5 RATING
1	Goal Area VIII	88.7%
2	Goal Area VII	38.7%
3	Goal Area V	88.4%
4	Goal Area VI	83.5%
5	Goal Area IV	82.0%
6	Goal Area III	80.7%
7	Goal Area II	77.8%
8	Goal Area I	52.9%

The data appear to indicate that strategies related to (1) establishing student and/or faculty racial balancing in a district (Goal Area I) and (2) promoting community involvement and/or improving community communications (Goal Area II) received the lowest overall ratings of their strategies' effectiveness.

Traditionally, these are two areas where school districts tend not to exert a conscious and/or systematic effort regarding their implementation.

Such impositions or pressures brought on by desegregation cause an extraordinary amount of intensive planning. In addition, they are often accompanied by such factors as resistance, confusion and resentment. This tends to create negative feelings on the part of district personnel who must organize racial balancing procedures. Therefore, the imposition of this as a must or requirement may have induced district staff to rate this strategy lower in terms of effectiveness.

Typically, relationship between home/community and school have left much to be desired. Fear, suspicion, mistrust, lack of understanding, decision-making, and roles in the education of learners are some of the root causes for this uncertain relationship. Desegregation almost demands that school and parents/community cooperate for successful implementation. Again, schools are forced somewhat out of their "normal" mode of operation. Thus, the tendency exists to consider this as a less effective strategy.

For the survey, WIEDS determined that effectiveness of strategies was potentially possible in three ways. First, popularity of the strategy as measured by the frequency of respondent selection (Frequency = Σ (✓). Second, the mean of the rating for strategy effectiveness ($\overline{X} = \frac{\Sigma(1\text{-}5)}{n}$). Third, percentage of high ratings of strategy effectiveness as measured either by percentage of five (5) ratings on scale (frequency of ratings = $\Sigma(\frac{5 \text{ ratings}}{n})$ or percentage of 4 plus 5 scale ratings $\Sigma(\frac{4+5 \text{ ratings}}{n})$. The WIEDS staff concluded that desegregation techniques having satisfactory or positive outcomes would be rated successful more frequently, i.e., successful strategies could be determined by those rated as being successful. Conversely, a

high frequency of selection with respect to various strategies would not necessarily indicate effectiveness. Therefore, popularity was dropped as a potential method of determining strategy success.

The strategies were rank-ordered based upon three effectiveness rating criteria: (1) mean rating, (2) percentages of 4+5 ratings and (3) percentage of 5 ratings with respect to the surveys' 1-5 rating scale. Table 7 presents the top twenty (20) ranked strategies based upon rank ordering by each of these three criteria.

A most interesting and suggestive aspect of these three rank orderings is the identification of eight strategies found to be effective on each of the criterion. While differences exist among the three lists of rank-order ratings of the top twenty effective strategies, the same eight appear in each list. Apparently, respondents perceive that the need for effective communication skills is an important aspect of facilitating school desegregation. A corollary to this strategy is the perceived effectiveness of student-faculty contact. If school staff either utilize or are trained in effective communication skills with respect to their own interactions and those with students, more meaningful contact on both levels could occur. Evidently, both are perceived as being beneficial to school desegregation success.

Expanding the counseling program as a perceived successful strategy could have several meanings. These include making more career information available, more assistance in career pursuits, increasing choices for course selection, further ensuring that basic requirements are met and allowing students to feel more a part of decisions about their educational and personal goals. Schooling in a desegregated setting could then take on more meaning

TABLE 7. STRATEGIES RANK ORDERED BY MEAN EFFECTIVENESS RATING, PERCENT EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS OF "4+5" AND PERCENT EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS OF "5"

COLUMN 1				COLUMN 2				COLUMN 3			
STRATEGY	Frequency Checked (✓)	Mean Effectiveness Rating	Rank Order	STRATEGY	Frequency Checked (✓)	% Effectiveness Rating 4+5	Rank Order	STRATEGY	Frequency Checked (✓)	% Effectiveness Rating "5"	Rank Order
*Minority participation in extra-curricular activities	105	4.34	1	*Communications skills training	41	97.6	1	Parent bus rides	14	42.9	1
*Upgrading facilities and equipment	84	4.30	2	*Minority participation in extra-curricular activities	105	97.1	2	Solicitation of ESAA funds	106	41.9	2
*Enlarge counseling program	81	4.30	3	Teaching effectiveness training	66	96.6	3	Crisis intervention team	18	38.9	3
*Communication skills training	41	4.29	4	Leadership effectiveness training	46	95.6	4	Hiring bilingual teachers	40	37.5	4
Hiring bilingual teachers	40	4.27	5	*More teacher aides hired	107	95.3	5	*Minority participation in extra-curricular activities	105	37.1	5
*Minority participation in student government	96	4.27	6	*Enlarge counseling program	81	95.1	6	*Upgrading facilities or equipment	84	36.9	6
*More teacher aides hired	107	4.26	7	*Student-faculty contact	68	94.1	7	Community liaison workers	53	35.9	7
Community liaison workers	53	4.26	8	*Upgrading school facilities and equipment	84	94.0	8	Parents as school employees	67	35.8	8
Solicitation of ESAA funds	106	4.25	9	Disciplinary skills training	48	93.8	9	*Enlarge counseling program	81	34.6	9
*Reduction of pupil-teacher ratio	81	4.25	10	*Minority participation in student government	96	93.7	10	*Reduce pupil-teacher ratio	81	33.3	10
*Student-faculty contact	68	4.25	11	Individualized instruction	94	92.6	11	Vocational training program	87	33.3	11
Minority participation in accelerated classes	70	4.20	12	Behavior modification training	52	92.3	12	*Minority participation in student government	96	33.3	12
Leadership effectiveness training	46	4.20	13	Solicitation of staff input re: desegregation activities	51	92.1	13	Parents as volunteers	72	31.9	13
Human relations activities for students	62	4.21	14	Human relations activities for students	33	91.9	14	*Communication skills training	41	31.7	14
Creation of new extra-curricular activities	43	4.21	15	Current students orient new students	37	91.9	15	*Student-faculty contact	68	30.9	15
Individualized instruction	94	4.19	16	Minority participation in accelerated classes	70	91.5	16	*More teacher aides hired	107	30.8	16
Vocational training program	87	4.18	17	*Reduction of teacher-pupil ratio	81	91.3	17	New extra-curricular activities	43	30.2	17
Parents as volunteers	72	4.18	18	Training in ethnic and cultural behaviors	46	91.3	18	Increased number of bilingual staff	40	30.0	18
Teaching effectiveness training	58	4.16	19	Use of community resources	68	91.2	19	Human relations activities for students	62	29.0	19
Training in use of bilingual materials	38	4.16	20	Training about racial stereotyping	44	90.9	20	Modify discipline policies	62	29.0	20

*These eight strategies were found to be effective on the basis of the three different criteria with respect to the effectiveness ratings: (1) mean rating, (2) percent of ratings "4+5", and (3) percent of ratings "5."

and relevance. Apparently, the disparity between facilities and equipment in schools which are segregated becomes more to the forefront when desegregation takes place. This seems to be supported by the presence of "upgrading facilities and equipment" as a reported successful strategy on all three lists. Thus, school desegregation is enhanced through the strategy of improving the quality of these two factors.

Seven (7) different strategies were found to be effective based only on the mean rating and the percent ratings of "5." These included (1) hiring bilingual teachers, (2) using community liaison workers, (3) conducting human relations activities for students, (4) creating new extracurricular activities, (5) having vocational training programs, (6) solicitation of ESAA funds and (7) use of parents as volunteers. Five (5) other strategies were found to be effective on the basis percent ratings of "5" only. They are as follows: (1) modification of discipline policies, (2) increasing number of bilingual staff, (3) using parents as school employees, (4) use of crisis intervention team, and (5) providing parents with trial bus rides. Finally, four separate strategies were found to be effective based only on the mean rating and percent ratings of "4" + "5." Teacher effectiveness training, leadership effectiveness training, individualized instruction and minority participation in accelerated classes comprised this grouping.

With the exception of trial parent bus rides (checked only fourteen times), all of the other eight strategies found in each rank-ordered group ranged in frequency checked from 40 to 107. The small number of persons (14) reporting trial parent bus rides as an effective strategy tends to lessen its comparative value with other strategies. Only six, or 42.9%, respondents rated it "5" in terms of effectiveness. Thus, while ranking as first on this

list, its total number of frequencies checked is far out of proportion to the range for other strategies regarding frequency checked.

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate what were the specific areas of need or problems that remain in their districts regarding desegregation. No systematic response mode or format was provided other than space in which to write the information. An examination of the responses revealed that remaining needs or problems exist as follows:

1. lack of black administrators and faculty (12)*
2. non-compliance and racial imbalance (8)
3. segregated classrooms
4. busing (9)
5. white flight (6)
6. establishing lines of communication with community (11)
7. inadequate teacher attitudes and cooperation (6)
8. discipline and racial disruptions (17)
9. inappropriate curriculum for multiethnic student population (7)
10. differential treatment of minority students (5)

Additional remaining need/problem areas (those mentioned by less than five respondents) include minority student classroom isolation, insufficient funds for desegregation planning/implementation, lack of bilingual programs, lack of community/teacher/staff input for desegregation planning, community leader support, disproportionate placement of minorities in special education/vocational programs, ineffective affirmative action programs, lack of sensitivity by white school staff, more human relations/communication skills

---

* Indicates number of respondents who cited this as a problem/area of need.

training and segregated school functions. While this list is not replete, it provides a rather insightful look into problem areas which remain to be sufficiently dealt with in desegregated schools. These responses offer support for the notion of WIEDS staff that effective SD/IE is one of the most critical factors in successful school desegregation.

Interview Results

Interviews were conducted with five levels of persons at each of the six sites (school districts). Queries with respect to interviewee perceptions of strategy effectiveness were conducted. Several of the strategy inquiries held with participants were similar to those asked on the survey. Slight differences existed in terms of the range of strategy effectiveness probing done with each level of interviews. Central office persons, principals and teachers were queried about effectiveness of (1) community/parent involvement strategies used with desegregation process, (2) staff development provided to implement desegregation, and (3) strategies used to desegregate classrooms and improve instruction.

Students and parents/community persons were asked to provide information regarding their perceptions of increased and improved (1) student interrelationships, (2) classroom assistance with learning problems, (3) participation in extracurricular activities and (4) community/parent involvement in desegregation process (parents/community persons only). Interview schedule items were derived from strategies in each of the Goal Areas found in Table 5, page 23, of this report.

Three of the interview sites are primarily black and Anglo and one is essentially Hispanic and Anglo. Two are triracial with one being Anglo-black-Hispanic while the other's racial composition is Anglo-black-American Indian.

The seventeen most effective strategies for solving desegregation problems as a result of frequency mentioned by all interviewees are shown in Table 8. Communications (Goal Areas II, III, V and VII), parent involvement (Goal Areas II and V), and equal educational opportunity (Goal Areas I, V, VI and VII) appear to be the most effective strategies for dealing with school desegregation problems. These strategies are embedded within several of the Goal Areas. The top rank-ordered strategy (according to total frequency by categories and race) communications, supports the finding from survey rankings of effective strategies by Goal Area. In the survey, strategies within Goal Areas III, V, VI, and VII were indicated as being 80% or more effective, with Goal Area II having 78% effectiveness based upon 4+5 ratings.

The same appears to be true of perceived effectiveness regarding parent involvement as an effective desegregation strategy, although to a slightly lesser degree. Parent involvement is a part of Goal Areas II and V which were ranked seventh (78%) and third (88.4%) respectively based upon 4+5 ratings in the survey. Combining parent and community involvement may have lessened the perceived effectiveness of parent involvement itself, thereby attributing for the nearly 10% rating difference when considered with community involvement.

Equal educational opportunity, as the third highest ranked strategy by interviewees, is an integral part of several Goal Areas. Specifically, it can be found in strategies for Goal Areas I, V and VI (e.g., magnet schools, bilingual education, home-based instruction, minority participation in accelerated classes, etc.). These strategies were ranked eighth, third and fourth respectively. Of interest is the apparent difference in perceived effectiveness of Goal Area I (student/faculty racial balance)

TABLE 8. SEVENTEEN MOST EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR SOLVING DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS: IN RANK ORDER (BY FREQUENCY) AND BY CATEGORIES AND RACE COMBINED

RANKING	STRATEGIES	TOTAL FREQUENCY BY INTERVIEWEE LEVELS AND ETHNICITY
1	Communication	37
2	Parent Involvement	28
3	Equal educational opportunity	26
4	Curriculum	17
5	Open and qualified administration	16
6	Racial balance	15
7	Student participation	14
8	Staff development	14
9	Busing	12
10	Ethnic awareness	11
11	Attitudes	9
12	Sensitive to student problems	9
13	Don't know	6
14	Good leadership	4
15	Legalistic procedures	4
16	Equal treatment	4
17	Neighborhood schools	4

rated last by survey respondents but third by interviewees in terms of increasing educational opportunity. Perhaps the rigors of planning and implementation regarding this Goal Area (I) by superintendents tend to lessen perceived effectiveness on their parts. Whereas, other school staff, students, and parents/community persons who can see and/or gain direct benefits tend to view this strategy as more effective.

The average mean effectiveness scores (Race x Category) for strategies to promote parent/community involvement and improve communication with the community are presented in Table 9. Teacher/staff reassignment and increasing minority staff/faculty were the two strategies which central office, principal and parent/community persons had the most familiarity with and rated to be most effective for Goal Area I. Teacher/staff reassignment received a mean score of 4.84 from 1-5 ratings of its perceived effectiveness (n = 25) and increasing minority staff faculty received a mean score of 5.00 from 1-5 ratings of effectiveness (n = 5).

Apparently, Goal Area II strategies were perceived as being very effective overall by interviewees. A three-point rating scale for interviewees as opposed to 4+5 ratings by survey respondents may have a bearing on the comparison of findings. However, interviewees seemingly differ with respect to survey respondents in their perceptions of Goal Area II desegregation strategy effectiveness. Overall, interviewees ranked these strategies very high, 4.83 of a possible 5.00. Whereas, survey respondents ranked these strategies, 52.9% out of a possible 100% in terms of their reported ratings of effectiveness by Goal Area.

An interesting aspect of the findings is that all interviewees (n = 14) who indicated community liaison worker as an effective strategy within Goal

TABLE 9. STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND IMPROVE COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY RANK ORDERED ACCORDING TO AVERAGE MEAN SCORES

STRATEGY	N	AVERAGE MEAN EFFECTIVENESS SCORE	RANK
Community liaison worker	14	5.00	1
Public forums	19	4.95	2
District/school/community liaison	30	4.90	3
Human relations/other training for parents/community persons	20	4.89	4
Parents as volunteer aides in schools	30	4.87	5
PTA	38	4.87	5
Parent/community workers as classroom resources	29	4.86	6
Community centers in schools	7	4.86	6
Rumor/information center	25	4.84	7
Speaking to church, social or other groups	11	4.82	8
Written information to parents	22	4.77	9
Media use	38	4.76	10
Parents as school employees	17	4.70	11
Neighborhood coffees	9	4.56	12

Scale: 3 = none; 4 = somewhat; 5 = most

Average mean score = $\frac{\Sigma \text{ mean score by race} + \Sigma \text{ mean score by respondent category}}{2}$

Area II rated it 5, the highest rating. Again, the need for meaningful liaison between school and home/community during desegregation is emphasized. Only 2 out of 19 interviewees rated public forums less than 5, the highest rating. Evidently, discussions with and for the public about desegregation are deemed an important part of the effectiveness of this process. District/school/community liaison is a broadened look at the community liaison worker strategy. It appears that a liaison linkage between the school district (central office usually); schools (principal and staff) and the community (parents and significant others) which can enhance the success of school desegregation is of vital importance.

In Goal Area III, only one site experienced a district-wide crisis during the desegregation process. However, several schools within the various sites had conflicts to the extent that they were closed for short periods of time. Of the six (6) crisis resolution strategies mentioned during interviews, "law inforcement involved" was indicated as being used most (36.4%, n = 4). Interestingly though, the most effective crisis prevention strategies were (1) central administration working with students, (2) central administration working with parents/community and (3) central administration working with school staff. Approximately 73.3% (33 out of 45) of the interviewees indicated the use of these strategies as being effective.

Findings with respect to Goal Area IV concerning strategy effectiveness were not dealt with as a separate entity in the interviews. Instead, effectiveness regarding strategies to infuse multicultural perspectives into education for desegregated schools was addressed under Goal Area IV.

The strategies to promote compensatory education for minority students (Goal Area V) were often identified as being bilingual and multicultural programs by interviewees. However, most of the responses referred to the use of Title I programs as a strategy for dealing with compensatory education issues. From the data available, no determination could be made regarding the resegregatory effects of using compensatory education strategies for minority students in the desegregation process.

No specific strategies were rated for effectiveness regarding the promotion of positive race relations (Goal Area VI) in the interviews. Instead, interviewees were asked to rate, based upon their perceptions, the quality of race relations between seven paired groups of persons in each district. A five (5) point scale was used to rate the quality of relations. The overall mean ratings for quality with respect to each paired group is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10. MEAN RATINGS OF QUALITY OF RACE RELATIONS IN SCHOOLS

GROUP	n	MEAN RATING
Students-Students	160	4.30
Students-Teachers	159	4.23
Teachers-Teachers	159	4.51
Teachers-Parents	154	4.12
Administrators-Students	159	4.38
Administrators-Teachers	156	4.46
Administrators-Parents	155	4.40

Scale: Very Well 5 4 Satisfactory 3 2 Not Well 1

Specifically, interviewees were asked to rate how well majority students, teachers or administrators got along with minority students, teachers, parents and administrators. The data indicate that positive race relations were rated highest between the teacher-teacher paired group ($\overline{X}$ = 4.51). Close behind were positive relations between administrators-parents of different races and administrators-students of different races. The findings did not indicate why these relations were more positive than others.

Interviewees were not asked to rate the effectiveness of staff development/inservice education (SD/IE) strategies used to facilitate desegregation and promote integration (Goal Area VII). Correlations were conducted with respect to (1) relationship of SD/IE activities and atmosphere when desegregation began, (2) possible SD/IE effects on community support by racial group and (3) relationship of SD/IE and school relations. These findings are not reported here. Although no ratings of strategy effectiveness regarding administrative procedures used to facilitate the desegregation process (Goal Area VIII) were requested from interviewees, several, perhaps, useful comments did surface. Maintenance of cultural heritage/ethnic identity (e.g., retaining names of previously all-black schools), preschool orientations and welcoming activities were among those mentioned as being used to promote integration and avoid resentment/resistance from the community. Expanded use of federal programs (ESAA, Title I, etc.) was also viewed as being of useful assistance in facilitating desegregation.

Interviewees were also asked to indicate what they felt were remaining areas of need or problems with respect to school desegregation. The

following items comprise their responses. These responses had four persons or more interviewees listing them as a remaining area of need or problem:

1. More student participation/involvement (n = 25)
2. Improving attitudes of administrators, faculty, students and parents (n = 19)*
3. More parent involvement (n = 14)
4. Improving quality of education (n = 13)
5. Decreasing disciplinary problems (n = 9)*
6. More hiring of minority staff (n = 7)*
7. More communications among administrators/ faculty/students/parents (n = 5)*
8. More racial balancing in schools (n = 5)*
9. More equal educational opportunities (n = 4)
10. More cultural awareness for teachers (n = 4)
11. Decreasing student/parent apathy (n = 4)
12. Improving school facilities at original all minority schools (n = 4)
13. More multicultural curriculum for everyone (n = 4)*

*Similar in nature to need areas mentioned by survey respondents.

Summary

School desegregation exerts a significant impact on public education in our country. Each year a number of school systems, either through voluntary or mandatory decisions, face the issues and problems attendant to desegregation. Busing, staff/faculty/student racial mixing or balancing, revised policies/procedures, hiring of new staff (especially minorities), increased budget expenditures, expanded curriculum and instructional approaches, more parent/community involvement, a broadened focus on multicultural/bilingual educational experiences and some form of staff development/

inservice education are a few of the activities which accompany desegregation. The extent to which they are utilized ranges anywhere from minimal or cursory efforts to those well-organized, implemented and evaluated. If more success is to be experienced in desegregation activities, much more of the latter has to occur.

The WIEDS staff has maintained that effective SD/IE is a most critical aspect of the desegregation process. SD/IE, as a process, must be comprehensive and have at least five (5) major components to be successful (King, 1980). These components are as follows: planning, preparation, implementation, application and evaluation. Within each of these components are a set of sequential processes to be carried out. Since each of the components represent a sort of logical order for SD/IE, it is important that their inherent processes be followed in a systematic manner. King (1980) describes the set of processes in a model designed to evaluate SD/IE in desegregated schools. It is posited here that SD/IE is perhaps the most critical element in effecting relevant and successful school desegregation.

Through a survey and a set of interviews, WIEDS attempted to determine what kinds of strategies were perceived as being successful in desegregating schools. Information was sought from those who should be, but are not always, important team members in facilitating the desegregation process. The survey gathered data from school superintendents (or their designates) and GAC personnel while the interviews collected valuable insights from parents/community persons, students, teachers, principals and central office personnel. Although the participants were not randomly selected, the results from their responses were very similar in nature and offer useful directions for school desegregation, especially for SD/IE.

Eight basic goal areas, each with its own set of embedded strategies, form the basis upon which the survey and interview data were examined and analyzed. Essentially, the goal areas dealt with (I) desegregation of staff/faculty and students, (II) promotion of community involvement and increased communication, (III) prevention/resolution of desegregation crisis situations, (IV) infusing multiculturalism into desegregation education, (V) promotion of compensatory education for minority students, (VI) promotion of positive race relations, (VII) provision of SD/IE to facilitate desegregation and promote integration and (VIII) utilization of administrative procedures which facilitate desegregation.

Both survey and interview data appear to indicate the following strategies as being successful based upon analysis of data from these investigations:

a. Goal Area VIII strategies appear to be the most popular* of those used in desegregating schools, with widespread securing of supplementary (federal, state, etc.) funds, upgrading of facilities and equipment and expanding counseling programs reported as being most successful.

b. Goal Area VII strategies as a whole were second-ranked in terms of overall effectiveness; with classroom management training, use of multicultural/bilingual materials, cultural awareness and communication skills training being reported as the most effective SD/IE strategies; in addition, SD/IE needs improvement, especially in desegregation/integration content, to enhance desegregation school education; of special concern

*Based upon survey goal area rankings by average percent of reported 4+5 ratings.

here was the report by a significant portion of central office persons (33%), principals (50%), and teachers (40%) having had no desegregation related training prior to their involvement.

c. Goal Area V strategies ranked third in overall effectiveness, with the increasing of the number of teacher aides, most often through use of Title I funds, being reported as the most effective strategy; more minority school staff was apparently viewed as a means of enhancing compensatory education for minority students; another outcome was the reduction in teacher/pupil ratios in learning situations.

d. Goal Area VI, fourth-ranked in terms of overall effectiveness, had a slight difference in terms of the most effective strategy; survey participants found minority participation in extra-curricular activities with minority participants in student government and more student/faculty contact the most effective strategies, whereas interviewee perceptions of the quality of race relations in the schools tend to indicate that increased student/faculty contact (social and work related) may be important for promoting positive relations; the direct relationship between survey and interview findings is less clear in this goal area.

e. Goal Area IV, ranked fifth with respect to overall effectiveness, saw survey participants indicate the use of multicultural materials to be most effective; interviewees indicated that although effective, such materials were neither available in all schools nor were such audiovisual materials very

accessible; this is an interesting finding in that many desegregating school districts usually have allocations in their expanded budgets to acquire such materials which makes the reported issue of availability and accessibility of such materials one needing further exploration.

f. Goal Area III, the sixth-rated area, produced a rather unclear picture with respect to effectiveness of its strategies; for crisis resolution, working closely with law officials was deemed most useful, whereas, administrators working directly but informally with those involved was favored in the survey; interview data produced no clear preference but did indicate that multicultural input and strategies designed to improve race relations could be effective in crisis resolution and prevention; these findings tend to indicate that not enough consideration is given to crisis issues in preparing for desegregation; crisis hotline, intervention teams, etc., were least mentioned.

g. Goal Area II was seventh-ranked although trial parent bus rides, community liaison workers and district/community liaison or advisory groups were deemed effective strategies; this points out the need for giving more consideration to these strategies (school/community cooperation) in the desegregation process.

h. Goal Area I, ranked eighth and last among all areas, found reassignment of staff/faculty as its most frequently used strategy, but hiring of additional minority staff as the most successful strategy in student/faculty racial balancing;

although not included among strategies for this goal area, busing was mentioned as a primary tool and its attendant problems less intense but not completely solved.

An examination of the survey and interview indicate that no one strategy or set of strategies alone could be employed to facilitate successful desegregation of schools. Collaboration and cooperation are required by many levels of people and on a variety of issues and activities. School desegregation efforts cannot be fragmented or short-term in duration. It should be clear that the pluralism of our society needs affirmation and reflection in all we see, hear, feel and do with respect to the school desegregation process. Anything less, detracts from the invaluable contributions to better schooling that have been and can be made by members from various cultures within the American society.

Schooling plays a major role in the perpetuation of society's values, traditions, goals, etc. In doing so, schooling must be reflective of the multicultural nature of those it seeks to educate. Multiculturalism should not be viewed as a hindrance to the acquisition of necessary knowlege, skills, attitudes and experiences, but rather as an important catalyst which enhances these factors. For as all learners are provided relevant educational experiences which bring success academically and personally, so increased are the chances that more literate citizenry will take their places in our complex society as effective and contributing members. While this is appropriate for all schools, it is especially true for desegregated and desegregating schools.

With the many constraints desegregated schools face today, caution should be taken with respect to placing extra demands upon them. The survey and interview findings indicate that rather than placing further imposition

on such schools, it is proposed that implementing a well designed SD/IE program would better contribute to their overall success. Crucial to providing relevant educational experiences in desegregated schools is the preparation of all participants to work together effectively. Clearly, such preparation has not been prevalent in a sufficient enough manner to help ensure the kind of educational experiences necessary for school desegregation success. Through SD/IE--which has a cross-section of participant/beneficiary input, is multicultural in focus and content, employs a wide range of strategies, is systematic in its plans, preparation, implementation, application and evaluation and is long range in terms of goals and objectives--desegregated schools can take a significant step forward in achieving success. Such success will be seen in the improvement of quality educational experiences for all learners and increased equality of educational opportunity.

In conceptualizing models and guidelines for improved SD/IE in desegregated schools, it is recommended that the following content areas should be included based upon implications from survey and interview findings:

1. utilization of teacher, classroom, school or community aides
2. intra-school communication skills training
3. identification, selection, use and evaluation of multi-ethnic materials or resources
4. "extra" school communication skills training, especially regarding parents and community persons
5. multicultural/bilingual approaches to curriculum and instruction
6. a triadic (home-school-community), cooperative approach to improving educational relevance and meaning
7. developing classroom atmospheres conducive to stimulating and motivating all pupils to learn

8. improving interpersonal relationships at student-student, student-teacher, student-administrator, teacher-teacher, teacher-parent/community, teacher administrator, administrator-parent/community levels

9. classroom management/alternative discipline skills training

10. organizing classrooms to meet needs of all learners

11. building educational opportunities and experiences based on backgrounds and capabilities of learners

12. different methods to evaluate academic success

13. advising and counseling minority students with respect to career goals and opportunities

14. developing a program of various and relevant extra-curricular activities

15. appropriate alternatives to first prevent crisis situations, then, if need be, resolve them

16. training to provide minority students with more opportunities for sharing in decision-making and authority of school

17. providing relevant life skills as a viable part of academic preparation

King (1980) concludes that such SD/IE will help to (1) eliminate negative classroom/school experiences, (2) improve teacher understanding, respect, sensitivity and knowledge of cultural/linguistic uniquenesses, (3) provide learning atmospheres which encourage and develop interracial friendship, understanding and harmony, (4) further develop ethnic literacy among pupils and teachers, (5) encourage and allow cooperative/active participation in the educational process by parents/community and (6) prevent resegregation. Thus, through developing, implementing and evaluating effective SD/IE in desegregated schools, education for minority students in particular and all students in general will take on the added meaning and appropriateness for today's and tomorrow's learners.

REFERENCES

Bhaerman, R. D. "A Brief Statement of the AFT's Views on Inservice Education," in Creative Authority and Collaboration: A Collection of Position Papers. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse National Dissemination Center, 1977.

Boyer, James. "Inservice Training and Multicultural Education," in Creative Authority and Collaboration: A Collection of Position Papers. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse National Dissemination Center, 1977.

Clark, K. "Cornerstone For Democracy," Just Schools - Southern Exposure (A Special Report Commemorating The 25th Anniversary of The Brown Decision). Institute for Southern Studies: Chapel Hill: 1979; pp 143-145.

Cunningham, M. A. Staff Selection, Education and Utilization. Clearwater, Florida: Educational Resource and Development Council, 1969.

Darland, D., and R. Luke, "The NEA's Views On In-Service Education," in Creative Authority and Collaboration: A Collection of Position Papers. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse National Dissemination Center, 1977.

Gay, G. "Multicultural Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness in Desegregated Schools," Theory Into Practice, 1978; Vol. 17: pp. 149-156.

Grant, G. A., and Melnick, S. L. "Developing and Implementing Multicultural Inservice Teacher Education," in Issues In Inservice Education: State Action for Inservice. Syracuse, N.Y.; National Council of States On Inservice Education, 1976; pp. 45-52.

Howsam, R. B. "The Profession of Teaching," in Issues In Inservice Education: State Action for Inservice. Syracuse, New York: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1976; pp. 9-13.

King, A. L. Galindo, L. R., Northcutt, N., Williams, D. L. (Jr.), Final Report - Project WIEDS - June 1978 - Nov 1979; NIE Grant # OB-NIE-G-78-0108. 1979, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas.

King, A. L. Executive Summary of Final Report On Analyses of Staff Development Programs and Other Strategies to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools. 1980; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas.

Mizell, H. "Checklist For Quality Education," in Just Schools - Southern Exposure (A Special Report Commemorating the 25th Anniversary of the of the Brown Decision). Institute for Southern Studies; Chapel Hill: 1979.